# Case 9:06-cv-00075-JVS Document 1 Filed 05/11/06 Page 1 of 21 GINAL

J. David Slovak Tom L. Lewis LEWIS, SLOVAK & KOVACICH, P.C. P.O. Box 2325 Great Falls, MT 59403 (406) 761-5595 (406) 761-5805 - fax GREAT FALLS DIV. OK#15867
'06 MAY 11 AM 11 24 # 350

PATRICK E. DUFFY, CLERK

DEPUTY CLERK

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA MISSOULA DIVISION

Plaintiffs,  VS.  COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND  CITY OF MISSOULA, CITY OF  MISSOULA POLICE DEPARTMENT,  MISSOULA COUNTY, MISSOULA  COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,  CHIEF WICKMAN, OFFICER  McCARTHY, OFFICER SERBA,  SERGEANT RICHARDSON, SHERIFF  McMEEKIN, DEPUTY MEEDER,  DEPUTY WHITE DEPUTY  COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND  COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND	ERROLD G. COOLEY, JOLEE ) OOLEY, MICHAEL J. COOLEY, and ) AILEY COOLEY,	Cause No. <u>CV-06-75</u> - M-DWM
CITY OF MISSOULA, CITY OF  MISSOULA POLICE DEPARTMENT,  MISSOULA COUNTY, MISSOULA  COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,  CHIEF WICKMAN, OFFICER  McCarthy, Officer Serba,  SERGEANT RICHARDSON, SHERIFF  McMeekin, Deputy Meeder,	Plaintiffs, )	
MISSOULA POLICE DEPARTMENT, ) MISSOULA COUNTY, MISSOULA ) COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, ) CHIEF WICKMAN, OFFICER ) McCARTHY, OFFICER SERBA, ) SERGEANT RICHARDSON, SHERIFF ) McMEEKIN, DEPUTY MEEDER, )	) )	COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND
STINEFORD,and DOES A-Z. ) Defendants. )	ISSOULA POLICE DEPARTMENT, ) ISSOULA COUNTY, MISSOULA ) OUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, ) HIEF WICKMAN, OFFICER ) cCARTHY, OFFICER SERBA, ) ERGEANT RICHARDSON, SHERIFF ) IcMEEKIN, DEPUTY MEEDER, ) EPUTY WHITE, DEPUTY ) TINEFORD, and DOES A-Z. )	

Plaintiffs bring this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, and state law, for violation of Plaintiffs' federal and state constitutional, statutory, and common law rights. For their complaint against the Defendants, Plaintiffs allege as follows:

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 1. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, this Court has jurisdiction over this civil action because some of the claims arise under the Constitution and laws of the United States. The Court likewise has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1343 as Plaintiffs seek redress for the deprivation (under color of state law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage) of their rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Constitution of the United States and/or Acts of Congress.
- 2. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state law claims as they are so related to the claims in the action within the original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy.
- 3. On November 29, 2005, Plaintiffs filed Administrative Claims against the Defendants pursuant to § 2-9-301(3), MCA. Defendants failed to issue a final disposition within 120 days, thereby authorizing Plaintiffs to proceed with filing the present action.
- 4. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the District of Montana, Missoula Division, because all of the acts and omissions alleged herein occurred within the District of Montana, more specifically Missoula County, Montana, and one or more of the Defendants reside in the same.

#### **PARTIES**

 Plaintiffs Jerrold Cooley, Jolee Cooley, and Kailey Cooley are, and were at all times relevant hereto, citizens of the United States and residents of Missoula, Missoula County, Montana.

- Michael Cooley is, and was at all times relevant hereto, a citizen of the United States
  and resident of Missoula, Missoula County, Montana, currently attending college in
  Moses Lake, Washington.
- 7. Defendants City of Missoula (hereinafter "City") and Missoula County (hereinafter "County") are political subdivisions organized and existing under the laws of the State of Montana.
- Defendants City of Missoula Police Department (hereinafter "Police Department") and
   Missoula County Sheriff's Department (hereinafter "Sheriff's Department) are law
   enforcement agencies of the City and County.
- 9. Defendants Missoula County Sheriff McMeekin and Missoula City Police Chief Wickman are believed to have been, at all times relevant hereto, residents of the State of Montana and duly appointed (or elected) and acting peace officers of the City, County, Police Department, and/or Sheriff's Department. Said Defendants are being sued in their individual and official capacities.
- 10. Defendants Officer McCarthy, Officer Serba, Sergeant Richardson, Deputy Meeder, Deputy White, and Deputy Stineford are believed to have been, at all times relevant hereto, residents of the State of Montana and duly appointed and acting peace officers of the City, County, Police Department, and/or Sheriff's Department. Said Defendants are being sued in their individual and official capacities.
- 11. The true names and capacities of the Defendants named herein as Does A-Z, Inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs therefore bring this action against said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this Complaint

and Jury Demand to state the true names and capacities of Does A-Z when the same have been ascertained, together with further appropriate charging allegations. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege that each of the fictitiously named Defendants may be legally responsible in some manner for the occurrences alleged herein, and that Plaintiffs' damages as herein alleged may have been proximately caused by said Defendants' unlawful acts or omissions. Defendants Does A-Z, Inclusive, are natural persons, peace officers, corporations, partnerships, joint ventures, governmental entities, political subdivisions, or other legal entities that may be legally liable for Plaintiffs' injuries and damages as hereinafter alleged.

12. Each and every act, error, and/or omission attributable to the individual Defendants herein was committed within the scope of their duties of employment with the City, County, Police Department, and/or Sheriff's Department. Each and every act, error, and/or omission attributable to the individual Defendants is thus imputable to the City, County, Police Department, and/or Sheriff's Department. Each political subdivision herein is legally responsible to provide indemnification to the individual Defendants, and to pay all damages awarded herein, including punitive damages, in accordance with § 2-9-305, MCA.

# **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 13. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-12 set forth above.
- On October 15, 2005, following a family birthday dinner at El Cazador South in Missoula, Montana, Plaintiffs and husband and wife Jerrold and Jolee Cooley boarded

- the family GMC pick up truck with their children, Plaintiffs Michael and Kailey Cooley, to return to the family's residence.
- 15. At all times pertinent here, Plaintiffs acted lawfully and committed no act that would give rise to a lawful investigatory stop, search, seizure, or otherwise justify an invasion and violation of their constitutional, statutory, and common law rights.
- 16. Approximately two blocks from Plaintiffs' home, a law enforcement patrol vehicle approached from behind with its overhead lights on. Jerrold Cooley properly stopped his vehicle and waited for the officer to make contact. Additional law enforcement officers arrived at the scene shortly thereafter, at which time a "high risk" stop and investigation was initiated by the officers.
- 17. Using a loud speaker, an officer instructed Jerrold Cooley to exit the vehicle with his hands overhead and lift the collar of his shirt so they could visually inspect his waistband. At this juncture, Jerrold identified himself as a federal probation officer. With their guns drawn and pointed at Jerrold, the officers told him to "shut up" and instructed him to walk backwards toward their voices. Jerrold again identified himself as a federal probation officer, whereby the officers again barked at him to "shut up." The officers ultimately handcuffed Jerrold and placed him face down in the gravel. Jerrold witnessed three officers pointing guns at him in a "ready alert" position. As he again identified himself and inquired as to the reason for the stop and restraint, Jerrold was repeatedly ordered to "shut up."
- 18. The officers proceeded to instruct Michael Cooley in similar fashion. Jerrold advised his son to do exactly what the officers said, whereby Jerrold was again threatened to

"shut up." Michael had recently undergone shoulder surgery. As such, Jerrold and Michael requested that he be handcuffed in front of his body. The officers refused this request, electing to cuff Michael's arms behind his back, and forcibly placing him face down in the gravel. Michael writhed in pain while Jerrold again attempted to communicate with the officers. With their guns trained on Jerrold and Michael, the officers repeatedly ordered Jerrold to "shut up." The officers maintained the appearance of lethal force and failed to de-escalate despite the removal of any perceived threat.

- 19. The officers next instructed Jolee and Kailey Cooley to one-by-one exit the vehicle in similar fashion. Jolee and Kailey were then handcuffed, restrained, and forcibly placed into separate patrol cars.
- 20. The officers then conducted a search of the Cooley vehicle. The officers found nothing linking any of the occupants to a previously attempted and reported purse snatching. Finally, after determining that Plaintiffs had nothing to do with the purse snatching, the officers released Plaintiffs from custody.
- 21. During the ensuing discussion, an unmanned patrol car that has been negligently left in gear and/or not properly secured, rolled forward and rammed into the family's vehicle, resulting in significant property damage to the pick up truck.
- 22. At all times pertinent hereto, Plaintiffs were innocent of any wrongdoing, unarmed, and lawfully engaging in peaceful activities.

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(42 U.S.C. § 1983)

- 23. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-22 set forth above.
- 24. The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution grants all United States citizens the right to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures.
- 25. The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution grants all United States citizens the right to be free from deprivations of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

# (Officer McCarthy, Officer Serba, Sergeant Richardson, Deputy Meeder, Deputy White, and Deputy Stineford)

- 26. On October 15, 2005, Defendants, acting under color of state law, deprived Plaintiffs' of their rights prescribed by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.
- 27. On October 15, 2005, Defendants, acting under color of state law, used excessive force to (1) detain Plaintiffs without probable cause or legal justification, (2) restrain Plaintiffs' liberty by means of physical force and/or show of authority, and (3) search Plaintiffs' persons and effects.
- 28. The nature of the alleged crime did not merit the unlawful search and seizure and/or excessive use of force. At no time did Plaintiffs pose a threat to the safety of the officers or others, actively resist arrest, or attempt to evade arrest by flight. The

- officers' search, seizure, and use of excessive force was not objectively reasonable under the facts and circumstances confronting them.
- 29. During the unlawful search, seizure, and use of excessive force, Defendants acted with gross negligence, amounting to deliberate indifference to Plaintiffs' safety and well being and established constitutional rights.
- 30. Defendants' conduct violated clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known.

# (Chief Wickman and Sheriff McMeekin)

- 31. Defendants Wickman and McMeekin set in motion a series of acts by others, or knowingly refused to terminate a series of acts by others, which they knew or reasonably should have known would cause others to violate Plaintiffs' constitutional rights.
- 32. Defendants Wickman and McMeekin personally participated in the deprivation of Plaintiffs' constitutional rights or caused such deprivations to occur; enacted or ratified policies that resulted in the deprivation of Plaintiffs' constitutional rights; failed to properly train, supervise, and/or control law enforcement personnel which resulted in the deprivation of Plaintiffs' constitutional rights; and subsequently ratified such actionable conduct.
- 33. Defendants Wickman and McMeekin acquiesced to the constitutional deprivations and/or exhibited a reckless or callous indifference to Plaintiffs' rights. Defendants Wickman and McMeekin knowingly refused to terminate the acts resulting in the constitutional deprivations.

- 34. Defendants Wickman and McMeekin failure to properly investigate and punish historical constitutional deprivations encouraging a culture of illegal searches, excessive use of force, and other constitutional deprivations. Such failures amounted to deliberate indifference to Plaintiffs' constitutional rights.
- 35. The unlawful actions were set in motion by Defendants Wickman and McMeekin's actions and their actions and or inactions caused and/or contributed to the constitutional deprivations at issue.
- 36. Defendants Wickman and McMeekin's conduct or inaction amounted to deliberate indifference to Plaintiffs' constitutional rights. The constitutional deprivations were affirmatively linked to the acts or omissions of said Defendants.
- 37. Defendants Wickman and McMeekin's conduct violated clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known.

# (City of Missoula, City of Missoula Police Department, Missoula County, Missoula County Sheriff's Department)

- 38. The City, Police Department, County, and Sheriff's Department established policies that caused the violation of Plaintiffs' constitutional rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.
- 39. The Defendants' committed the unlawful actions and constitutional deprivations pursuant to policy statements, ordinances, regulations, customs, standard operating procedures, or official decisions adopted and/or promulgated by the officers/officials of the City, Police Department, County, and Sheriff's Department.

- 40. It is the policy, practice, and/or custom of the City, Police Department, County, and Sheriff's Department to negligently hire, employ, and retain law enforcement officers.

  The negligent hiring, employment, and retention amounted to deliberate indifference to the rights of persons with whom law enforcement officers under their employ would come into contact with, including Plaintiffs.
- 41. The City, Police Department, County, and Sheriff's Department were deliberately indifferent to and acted in conscious disregard for the need to train, supervise, and discipline law enforcement officers employed by them with respect to, *inter alia*, initiating and conducting investigatory stops, illegal searches, corroborating information relayed by citizen complaints, and the use of force.
- 42. The policies adopted by the City, Police Department, County, and Sheriff's Department regarding training, supervision, and discipline amounted to deliberate indifference to Plaintiffs' constitutional rights.
- 43. The individual(s) who violated Plaintiffs' constitutional rights was an official with final policy-making authority. Thus, the constitutional violations constituted acts of official governmental policies.
- 44. Through the policies, ordinances, regulations, customs, or official decisions, the City, Police Department, County, and Sheriff's Department endorsed unreasonable searches and seizures and application of excessive force by its law enforcement officers. Law enforcement officers employed by the City, Police Department, County, and Sheriff's Department, through custom and usage, engage(d) in persistent and widespread discriminatory practices that acquire the force of law.

- 45. The City, Police Department, County, and Sheriff's Department employed a policy of inaction or acquiescence relative to law enforcement misconduct which amounted to a failure to protect Plaintiffs' constitutional rights. The inaction amounted to deliberate indifference as the connection between the need for more or different training, supervision, and/or discipline and the likely constitutional deprivations were obvious.
- 46. The City, Police Department, County, and Sheriff's Department policies, ordinances, regulations, customs, or official decisions were the moving force behind Plaintiffs' constitutional violations.
- 47. Each of the foregoing acts and/or omissions (¶¶ 12-46), including the unlawful seizures, detentions, and excessive use of force, directly and proximately caused and/or contributed to Plaintiffs' constitutional deprivations, injuries, and damages.

# **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

# (Violation of Plaintiffs' Rights Under the Montana Constitution)

- 48. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-47 set forth above.
- 49. Plaintiffs have the following fundamental, inalienable rights under Montana's Constitution: the right to enjoy and defend their lives and liberties and seek safety, health, and happiness in all lawful ways (Article II, Section 3); the right to human dignity (Article II, Section 4); the right to individual privacy (Article II, Section 10); the right to be secure in their persons, papers, homes, and effects from unreasonable searches and seizures (Article II, Section 11); the right not to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law (Article II, Section 17); and the right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment (Article II, Section 22).

- 50. Defendants' acts and omissions on, and leading up to, October 15, 2005, violated Plaintiffs' aforementioned constitutional rights.
- 51. Plaintiffs have the right to certain unenumerated rights, including but not limited to, the right to seek recourse against those who violate Plaintiffs' aforementioned constitutional rights (Article II, Section 34); and the right to full legal redress (Article II, Section 16).
- 52. As a direct and proximate result of the violation of Plaintiffs' constitutional rights under the Montana Constitution, Plaintiffs suffered injury to their persons and property, resulting in damages described in greater detail below, to which they are entitled to full legal recourse and redress.

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

# (Negligence)

- 53. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-52 set forth above.
- 54. Defendants owed Plaintiffs a duty of safety and care while engaged in the practice of maintaining the peace. In carrying out their functions as law enforcement officers and entities, Defendants had to observe Plaintiffs' constitutional, statutory, and common law rights.
- 55. Defendants violated Plaintiffs' constitutional, statutory, and common law rights and breached the duties owed as described more particularly herein. The violations accrued, in part, as a result of Defendants' negligent: investigation and investigatory stop; faulty reliance on a citizen complaint; search and seizure; use of excessive force; negligent training, supervision, and discipline; enactment, enforcement, and violation

- of law enforcement policies and procedures; violation of Plaintiffs' constitutional, statutory, and common law rights; and negligent performance of official duties.
- 56. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligence, Plaintiffs suffered injury to their persons and property, resulting in damages described in greater detail below.

#### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### (False Imprisonment)

- 57. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-56 set forth above.
- 58. Defendants unlawfully restrained Plaintiffs against their will, resulting in the deprivation of Plaintiffs' liberty of movement or freedom to remain in the place of their lawful choice.
- 59. As a direct and proximate result of their false imprisonment, Plaintiffs suffered injury to their persons and property, resulting in damages described in greater detail below.

# **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

# (Assault and Battery)

- 60. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-59 set forth above.
- 61. Defendants intended such harmful or offensive contact with Plaintiffs' persons, or an imminent apprehension of such contact. Defendants' actions resulted in harmful or offensive contact with Plaintiffs' persons and/or an apprehension of such contact. Defendants use of force exceeded that reasonably necessary to effectuate the investigatory stop.

62. Plaintiffs suffered injuries and damages as a direct and proximate result of the harmful and offensive contact, and/or apprehension thereof, as described in greater detail below.

#### SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

# (Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

- 63. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-62 set forth above.
- 64. The negligent acts and omissions of Defendants caused serious or severe emotional distress to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs' serious or severe emotional distress was a reasonably foreseeable consequence of Defendants' acts and omissions.
- 65. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligent acts and omissions, Plaintiffs suffered damages on account of their serious or severe emotional distress.

# **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

# (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress)

- 66. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-65 set forth above.
- 67. The intentional act and omissions of Defendants caused serious or severe emotional distress to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs' serious or severe emotional distress was a reasonably foreseeable consequence of Defendants' acts and omissions.
- 68. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' intentional acts and omissions,

  Plaintiffs suffered damages on account of their serious or severe emotional distress.

# **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

# (Malicious Acts or Omissions)

69. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-68 set forth above.

**COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND - 14** 

- 70. Plaintiffs' damages as herein alleged were caused by Defendants' malicious acts or omissions.
- 71. Defendants knew of facts or intentionally disregarded facts that created a high probability of injury to Plaintiffs. Defendants deliberately proceeded to act with indifference to the high probability of injury to Plaintiffs.
- 72. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' intentional and malicious acts or omissions, Plaintiffs suffered damages as described in greater detail below.

# NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

# (Acting in Concert)

- 73. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-72 set forth above.
- 74. At all times pertinent hereto, the Defendants committed tortious acts, in concert with one another, in violation of Plaintiffs' constitutional, statutory, and common law rights.
- 75. The Defendants, acting in concert, joined together to violate Plaintiffs' constitutional, statutory, and common law rights and encouraged the violations by participating therein, thus further aiding and abetting such tortious acts.
- 76. The Defendants knew that the other participants' actions breached duties owed to Plaintiffs' and violated Plaintiffs' constitutional, statutory, and common law rights.

  Despite this knowledge, Defendants continued to offer substantial assistance or encouragement to the other participating tortfeasors.
- 77. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' concerted acts, Plaintiffs suffered damages as described in greater detail below.
- 78. Defendants are jointly and severally liable for Plaintiffs' damages.

### **COMPENSATORY DAMAGES**

- 79. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs suffered violations of their constitutional rights as set forth herein.
- 80. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs suffered physical and mental pain and injuries, incurred medical expenses, and may incur future medical expenses.
- 81. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs suffered serious or severe emotional distress.
- 82. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs suffered from fright, humiliation, disgrace, embarrassment, impairment of reputation and standing in the community, and injury to character.
- 83. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs suffered injury to property.
- 84. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs suffered a loss of their established course of life.

#### **PUNITIVE DAMAGES**

- 85. Plaintiffs have filed this cause of action against the law enforcement Defendants in their individual and official capacities.
- 86. At all times pertinent hereto: (1) Defendants exhibited a reckless or callous disregard for Plaintiffs' constitutional, statutory, and common law rights, (2) Defendants intentionally violated federal law, and/or (3) Defendants' conduct was precipitated by

- evil motive or intent. Accordingly, imposition of punitive damages is proper and warranted under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- 87. Defendants' unlawful acts and omissions were willful and/or reckless. Defendants deliberately proceeded to act with indifference to the high probability of injury. Such conduct justifies imposition of punitive damages, under §§ 27-1-220 and -221, MCA, in a sufficient amount to punish Defendants and to serve as a warning to other persons and legal entities similarly situated that conduct of the kind engaged in by these Defendants is unacceptable in our society and will not be tolerated.

# **ATTORNEY FEES**

- 88. 42 U.S.C. § 1988 provides that "[i]n any action or proceeding to enforce a provision of [§ 1983] . . . the court, in its discretion, may allow the prevailing party, other than the United States, a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs . . . . " Plaintiffs have brought this cause of action, in part, under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Accordingly, Plaintiffs may recover attorney fees incurred in prosecuting this cause of action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.
- 89. Under Montana law, Plaintiffs may recover attorney fees incurred herein pursuant to the private attorney general doctrine as (1) Plaintiffs seek to vindicate strong and socially important public policy, (2) Plaintiffs will incur substantial burden given the necessity for private enforcement of this action, and (3) a large volume of people stand to benefit from Plaintiffs' efforts. See *Montanans for Responsible Use of School Trust v. State ex rel. Bd. of Land Comm'rs*, 1999 MT 263, 296 Mont. 402, 989 P.2d 800.

# **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiffs hereby demand trial by jury on all issues so triable.

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against the Defendants as follows:

- Damages in a reasonable amount to fully compensate Plaintiffs for deprivation of constitutional rights;
- Damages in a reasonable amount to fully compensate Plaintiffs for any past and future medical expenses;
- Damages in a reasonable amount to fully compensate Plaintiffs for their past and future physical and mental pain and suffering;
- 4. Damages in a reasonable amount to fully compensate Plaintiffs for their past and future emotional distress.
- Damages in a reasonable amount to fully compensate Plaintiffs for the loss of their established course and way of life;
- 6. Damages in a reasonable amount to fully compensate Plaintiffs for their humiliation, loss of reputation and community standing, and injury to character;
- 7. Damages in a reasonable amount to fully compensate Plaintiffs for their injury to and lost use of property;
- 8. Punitive damages in a sufficient manner to punish Defendants and serve as a warning to other similarly situated persons and entities that such conduct will not be tolerated;
- 9. Attorney fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988;

#### Case 9:06-cv-00075-JVS Document 1 Filed 05/11/06 Page 19 of 21

- 10. Attorney fees pursuant to the private attorney general doctrine;
- 11. Plaintiffs' costs, and disbursements incurred herein; and
- 12. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_\_ day of May, 2006.

LEWIS, SLOVAK & KOVACICH, P.C.

By:

David Slovak

Tom L. Lewis

P.O. Box 2325

Great Falls, MT 59403 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Thu May 11 11:18:30 2006

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MISSOULA

, MT

75

Receipt No. 400 37249

Cashier rew

Check Number: 15867

DO Code Div No 4646 4

Sub Acct Type Tender Amount 1:516000 N 2 190.00 2:086900 N 2 60.00 3:086400 N 2 100.00

Total Amount

350.00

FILING FEE FOR NEW MSLA DIV CASE CV-06-0 75-M-DWM

COOLEY VS CITY OF MSLA BY CNSL LEWIS, SL OVAK & ROVACION

Thu May 11 11:10:30 2006

Check No. 15867

Amount\$ 350.00
Pay any Federal Reserve Bank or General Depository for credit to United States Treasury Symbol 4646

Case 9:06-cv-00075-JVS Document 1 Filed 05/11/06 Page 21 of 21

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS							
Jerrold G. Cooley, Jolee Cooley, Michael J. Cooley, and Kailey Cooley				City of Missoula, City of Missoula Police Department, Missoula County, Missoula County Sheriff's Department, et al.						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Missoula County, N			1T	County of Residence of	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant			Missoula County, MT		
(E)	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASE	ES)			•	LAINTIFF CASES (				
				NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.						
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Number)			Attorneys (If Known)						
Tom L. Lewis, J. David S	í, P.C.,	Charles E. McNeil; William L. Crowley; Brendan J. Rohan								
P.O. Box 2325, Great Fall										
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in O	One Box Only)		I. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only)  and One Box for Defendant)						
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government No	ot a Party)		P	rf def	Incorporated or Proof Business In This	incipal Place	PTF	DEF  4	
☐ 2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity		Citize	en of Another State	2 🗖 2			<b>1</b> 5	<b>5</b>	
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship	of Parties m Item III)				of Business In A	Another State			
				Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation					<b>□</b> 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	[ (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	 )	го	oreign Country						
CONTRACT	TORT	rs	FOR	FEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY		STATUT		
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR  362 Personal Injury -		510 Agriculture 520 Other Food & Drug	☐ 422 Appe	ral 28 USC 158 drawal	☐ 400 State R ☐ 410 Antitru		nent	
☐ 130 Miller Aet	☐ 315 Airplane Product	Med. Malpractice	<b>□</b> 6	525 Drug Related Seizure	1	GC 157	☐ 430 Banks a	and Banking	g	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability (	☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability		of Property 21 USC 881 30 Liquor Laws	PROPE	RTY RIGHTS	☐ 450 Comme ☐ 460 Deports			
& Enforcement of Judgment  151 Medicare Act		368 Asbestos Persona	մ 📮 6	40 R.R. & Truck	☐ 820 Copyrights		470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations			
152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	Injury Product Liability		i50 Airline Regs. i60 Occupational	☐ 830 Pater ☐ 840 Trade		□ 480 Солѕил		ліз	
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)		PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud		Safery/Health 590 Other			☐ 490 Cable/S ☐ 810 Selective			
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability [	371 Truth in Lending		LABOR		SECURITY	☐ 850 Securit	ies/Commo	dities/	
of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage		710 Fair Labor Standards Act	□ 861 HIA □ 862 Blac1		Exchange 875 Custom		<u>z</u> e	
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability C  360 Other Personal	385 Property Damage Product Liability	: 07	20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations		C/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 890 Other S	3410		
196 Franchise	Injury			30 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RS1 (	(405(g))	☐ 891 Agricul	ltural Acts		
REAL PROPERTY  ☐ 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS  U 441 Voting	PRISONER PETITION  510 Motions to Vacat		740 Railway Labor Aet 790 Other Labor Litigation		AL TAX SUITS a (U.S. Plaintiff	□ 892 Есопол □ 893 Enviro			
220 Foreclosure	☐ 442 Ensployment	Sentence	1 -	91 Empl. Ret. Inc.	_ or De	fendanı)	☐ 894 Energy	Allocation	Act	
<ul> <li>230 Rent Lease &amp; Ejectment</li> <li>240 Torts to Land</li> </ul>	O 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Hubeas Corpus: J 530 General		Security Act		-Third Party SC 7609	☐ 895 Freedon Act	m of Justom	ation	
<ul> <li>245 Tort Product Liability</li> <li>290 All Other Real Property</li> </ul>		535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Otl					☐ 900Appeal	of Fee Dete qual Acces		
D 250 Mil Guldi Rout Topany	Employment	550 Civil Rights					to Justic	e		
	Other	J 555 Prison Condition			}		950 Constit		f	
	440 Other Civil Rights									
ØI Original D 2 R	tata Carret	Chance Hom		istated or 💆 – anothe	ferred from er district fv)	□ 6 Multidistr	<sub>ict</sub> 🗖 7 j	Appeal to ludge from Magistrate ludgment	n e	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statu	ute under which you a	re filing (	De not cite jurisdictions	al statutes u	nless diversity):	2 115C 88 14	083 109	28	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of cau	se:		laim and pendent Sta	_	_	2 03C 9 <u>9</u> 1	703, 170		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER F.R.C.P. 2	S A CLASS ACTION	-	EMAND S	C	HECK YES only URY DEMAND:		eomplain	t:	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY		IUDGE N/A			DOCKE	T NUMBER				
DATE 05/11/2006	Ala	SGNATORE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	<u>\                                </u>	V ~~						_		
RECEIPT#A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP				MAG. JUE	OGE			